



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/672,133	09/26/2003	Stephen A. Ewald	19645.1	6111

49358 7590 08/23/2007  
CARLTON FIELDS, PA  
1201 WEST PEACHTREE STREET  
3000 ONE ATLANTIC CENTER  
ATLANTA, GA 30309

EXAMINER
----------

FADOK, MARK A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3625

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/23/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/672,133

Applicant(s)

EWALD, STEPHEN A.

Examiner

Mark Fadok

Art Unit

3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 was filed in this application after appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, but prior to a decision on the appeal. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114 and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the appeal has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114 and prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/2/2007 has been entered. Acknowledgement is made to the amendment to claims 1,9 and 12 and the addition of claim 20. The applicant's amendment and remarks have been carefully considered and were found to be persuasive, however after further consideration a new ground of rejection necessitated by amendment follows;

### ***Examiner's Note***

Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers or figures in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1,9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In this case the term "sufficient" does not establish the scope of the claim requirements.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 1-13, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesling et al. (US 2002/0132575 A1) in view of Borovoy (US 20030204446).**

Kesling et al. discloses a method for purchasing goods and services linked with broadcast media (par. 0039 and Figs. 1-3).

The method comprises receiving at least one broadcast receiver a broadcast media including information relating to goods and services that can be purchased by persons receiving the media; selectively recording purchase data at the broadcast receiver for a good and service that a person purchases relating to the broadcast media; sending the purchase data from the broadcast receiver to at least one server; receiving the purchase data at the at least one server; and verifying the purchase data from the broadcast receiver at the at least one server.

Kesling et al. references U.S. application serial number 09461,699 and incorporates such application by reference. See Kesling et al. at paragraphs [0007]-[0010]. Accordingly, the disclosure of such application forms part of the Kesling et al. disclosure as of the date of the incorporation by Kesling et al.

Kesling et al. builds upon the system and method disclosed by '699. The '699 disclosure states that "the receiver is adapted to receive an input from the user by which the user is able to signal an interest in purchasing a selection of music or data being played and/or displayed" ('699 at page 2, last line-page 3, line 2). Accordingly, claims 1, 9, 12 (as amended to recite "each receiver further selectively receiving a purchase request and recording purchase data for goods and services that a person purchases relating to the broadcast media" (claim 1, for example, and similar language in claims 9 and 12), is anticipated by Kesling et al.

Kesling teaches sending purchase related information back to the server using a one click method (para 0065), but does not specifically mention that the purchase is accomplishable without further interaction from the person. Bovovoy teaches using the Amazon.com one click method to send purchase data from a portable device to a website in a one click manner (para 0017). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include in Kesling providing a one-click method of ordering as taught by Borovoy, because it has been well establish that impulse buying is responsible for many sales and the removing of steps required to consummate the sale further provides for a impulse sale.

Regarding claim 3: the purchase data may be transmitted at a predetermined location (par. 0043).

Regarding claims 5 and 6, respectively: Kesling discloses that the broadcast media may be an advertisement (information about the purchase of a particular good or service) or a song (no information about the purchase of a such song).

Regarding claims 7 and 8, respectively: the broadcast receiver may comprise either a single device (par. 0041) or an "intermediate transfer device" may be additionally employed as a purchase selection device (par. 0042).

Applicant's attention is directed to the Kesling et al. disclosure regarding "low" and "high" power wireless transmitters (600 and 700, respectively).

In regards to claim 20, the combination of Kesling and Borovoy teach where in the two devices are separate (Kesling 00042).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

**Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kesling et al. (US 2002/0132575 A1) in view of Borovoy and further in view of Official Notice regarding secure communication channels.**

Kesling et al. does not disclose a secure communication channel. However, it is notoriously well-known to employ secure communication channels when endeavoring to conduct transactions of the type disclosed by Kesling. One of ordinary skill in the art would have modified the Kesling method to have included sending purchase data via a secure channel in order that confidential information relative to the customer or the customer's account is not readily intercepted.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments, see amendment, filed 7/2/2007, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-13, 15-20 under USC 102 have been fully considered and are

Art Unit: 3625

persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kesling in view Borovoy.

Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant asks how Patsioskas is being relied upon in the rejection of the instant claims. The examiner is unaware of any specific reference to the application of Patsiokas, but notes that Patsiokas may be referred to in subsequent office actions as teachings of claimed elements. Applicant is encouraged to consider the entire disclosure of the cited references.

#### **Traversal of claim 14**

A "traverse" is a denial of an opposing party's allegations of fact. The Examiner respectfully submits that applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to traverse what Examiner regards as knowledge that would have been generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made. Even if one were to interpret applicants' arguments and comments as constituting a traverse, applicants' arguments and comments do not appear to constitute an adequate traverse because applicant has not specifically pointed out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. 27 CFR 1.104(d)(2), MPEP 707.07(a). An adequate traverse must contain adequate information or argument to create on its face a



Art Unit: 3625

reasonable doubt regarding the circumstances justifying Examiner's notice of what is well known to one of ordinary skill in the art. In re Boon, 439 F.2d 724, 728, 169 USPQ 231, 234 (CCPA1971).

If applicant does not seasonably traverse the well known statement during examination, then the object of the well known statement is taken to be admitted prior art. In re Chevenard, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mark Fadok** whose telephone number is **571.272.6755**. The examiner can normally be reached Monday thru Friday 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Jeffrey Smith** can be reached on **571.272.6763**.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

***Commissioner for Patents***

***P.O. Box 1450***

Alexandria, Va. 22313-1450

or faxed to:

**571-273-8300**

[Official communications; including

After Final communications labeled

Art Unit: 3625

"Box AF"]


For general questions the receptionist can be reached at

571.272.3600

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mark Fadok', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

Mark Fadok

Primary Examiner